Proposal Reviews

#236: Ecosystem functions and habitat values of the San Pablo Bay shoals: integrated science in support of the CALFED ecosystem restoration program

US Geological Survey

Initial Selection Panel Review	
Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review	
Bay Regional Review	
External Scientific Review	#1 #2
Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding	#1 #2 #3 #4
Environmental Compliance	
Budget	

Initial Selection Panel Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP
Initial Selection Panel Review

Proposal Number: 236

Applicant Organization: US Geological Survey

Proposal Title: Ecosystem functions and habitat values of the San Pablo Bay shoals: integrated science in support of the CALFED ecosystem restoration program

Please provide an overall evaluation rating.

Explanation of Recommendation Categories: Fund

- **As Is** (a proposal recommended for funding as proposed)
- **In Part** (a proposal for which partial funding is recommended for selected project phases or components)
- **With Conditions** (a proposal for which funds are recommended if the applicant contractually agrees to meet the specified conditions)

Consider as Directed Action in Annual Workplan (a proposal addressing a high priority action that requires some revision followed by additional review prior to being recommended for funding)
Not Recommended (a proposal not currently recommended for funding-after revision may be considered in the future)

Note on "Amount":

For proposals recommended as Fund As Is, Fund In Part or Fund With Conditions, the dollar amount is the amount recommended by the Selection Panel.

For proposals recommended as Consider as Directed Action in Annual Workplan, the dollar amount is the amount requested by the applicant(s).

Fund	
As Is	**-**
In Part	**-**
With Conditions	**-**
Consider as Directed Action	**-**
Not Recommended	**X**

Amount: **$0**

Conditions, if any, of approval (if there are no conditions, please put "None"):

None.

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

The poorly articulated linkages among elements of the proposal reduces the chances of useful products from this costly study. Technical Panel concerns included, the utility of the models to inform managers is suspect. External reviewers had serious concerns about synthesis and product delivery. The proposal has value in the Bay region, and involves very experienced team members. Strategically, the proposal didn't articulate how it would make important contributions to or showcase ERP restoration. The proposal would provide new information per the IP priorities for the Bay region.

Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP
Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review Form

Proposal Number: 236

Applicant Organization: US Geological Survey

Proposal Title: Ecosystem functions and habitat values of the San Pablo Bay shoals: integrated science in support of the CALFED ecosystem restoration program

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

Superior: outstanding in all respects;
Above Average: Quality proposal, medium or high regional value, and no significant administrative concerns;
Adequate: No serious deficiencies, no significant regional impediments, and no significant administrative concerns;
Not Recommended: Serious deficiencies, significant regional impediments or significant administrative concerns.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
-Superior	**The Panel and external reviewer generally considered this proposal good to excellent because it addresses a major scientific and conceptual gap in the CALFED restoration program, has a phenomenally well qualified team of investigators and institutions and is very well conceived and designed. $5 million budget might even be justifiable given multidisciplinary approach and difficulty in studying the shoals ecosystem. However, the performance and contribution of the composite program, and whether is achieves an interdisciplinary rather than merely a multidisciplinary understanding of the system, will depend entirely on the dedication and mechanisms of coordination and synthesis; the reviewers were not convinced this was achievable in part because of the lack of obvious and coordinated integration. The Panel rated the proposal only ADEQUATE because of the distinct deficiencies in a project of this scope, complexity and cost, and the concerns that in present form the proposed study will not achieve a synthetic ecosystem study that is greater than the sum of the individual investigators and components. With revision to address the relatively trivial hypotheses, the lack of explicit component and disciplinary integration, and disciplinary gaps (i.e., fish component), resubmission of this proposal concept should be much more supportable by CALFED. In addition, the Panel suggest that in future research proposal evaluations CALFED should seriously consider how to address costly, interdisciplinary proposals such as this; one approach might be to conduct additional review beyond external and panel review to determine whether they provide the desirable ecosystem and programmatic integration.**
-Above average	
XAdequate	
-Not recommended	

1. **Goals and Justification.** Does the proposal present a clear statement of goals, objectives and hypotheses? Does the proposal present a clear justification and conceptual model for the project?

   External reviews were moderately supportive (1 excellent, 2 good). Goals and objectives are clear and highly integrated under discrete tasks, although somewhat ambitious. Hypotheses are of marginal utility, and are almost trivial in some cases. A well-described schematic conceptual model is included to the benefit of understanding how the study components might be related. The study will build on earlier and on-going studies of phytoplankton, zooplankton, shorebird and diving duck distributions, hydrodynamics and suspended sediments in San Pablo Bay and adjacent San Francisco Bay waters. Some reviewer concerns about linkages to management and restoration may be addressed by the projects assessment of CALFED restoration projects on carbon and sediment flux in the San Pablo Bay shoals, and the importance of the anticipated results rests in a much better understanding of the role of shallow water shoals relative to adjacent wetlands and the broader, deeper waters of the Bay.

2. **Likelihood of Success (Approach, Feasibility, Capabilities and Performance Measures).** Is the project likely to succeed based on the approach, feasibility and project team capabilities? Are the proposed performance measures adequate for measuring the project's success?

Despite an absolutely hot team of highly qualified investigators and institutions, all with extensive experience in their role in this study, likelihood of success depends entirely on integration, which is not the proposals strongest forte. There is no cohesive description of a comprehensive sampling design that demonstrates how effectively the respective study components overlap in measurement, time and space, which would suggest the level of integration. For instance, given how much the broad project goal was buried in the narrative (pg. 4), one external reviewer wondered if the goal was actually well integrated in the minds of all the applicants and they really were committed to conducting their research in an integrated way. Explicit objectives might help provide some of the needed integration, if they really do result in cohesive organization of the study tasks. And, however simplistic, the conceptual model clearly identifies intended linkages among the physical and biological components of the Bay. From the standpoint of the approach, the objectives, tasks and methodologies of each element is exceedingly well articulated but not necessarily accompanied by sufficient detail about sampling plans, methods to estimate abundance and productivity. There may be few obvious concerns simply because of the experience and knowledge of the investigators in conducting such complex field-based research, although there may be some naiveté about the ability of 1-m2 enclosures to survive tidal and wave energies on the shoals.

A significant weakness in this study is the lack of a significant and distinct benthic fish component and appropriate investigator responsible for it. This study will depend extensively on on-going CDFG (presumably IEP) fish studies in the Bay for estimates of fish densities and diet and contaminant samples, but without a dedicated investigation of the benthic fish community response to other environmental and ecological conditions they are documenting on the shoals. Explicit integration is confined to fortuitous interpretation of the hydrodynamics (Task 1) and erosion of shallow and mudflats (Task 2) with mechanistic modeling of benthic predation (Task 9); that precludes seven other study tasks, most notably the water column processes. Explicit definition of the projects integration is relegated to project meetings and an internet home page, hardly acceptable for a ~$5 million study!

3. **Outcomes and Products.** Will the project advance the state of scientific knowledge in general and/or make an important contribution to the state of knowledge of the Bay-Delta Watershed? For restoration proposals, is the project likely to contribute to ecosystem restoration or species recoveries in a significant way? Will the project produce products useful to decision-makers and scientists?

   The proposal provides a reasonable and detailed list of products and modes of information dissemination, including public outreach. It could be argued that, by themselves, the results of the discrete project components would provide valuable information to the CALFED science and restoration community. However, the results of this study should be synthetic, but there is not obvious evidence that this will result. This study is not acceptable if it simply results in a plethora of poorly integrated reports and scientific papers.

   Similarly, additional concerns are expressed about whether the study will provide managers with the means to evaluate the role of shoals, whether or not they are worth preserving relative to historical conditions, and their function relative to wetland restoration efforts. In particular, the utility of the models to inform managers is suspect.

4. **Cost/Benefit Comments.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

   ~$5 million will be a burdensome price tag for CALFED if the separate elements in the proposal are not well integrated!

5. **Regional Review.** How did the regional panel(s) rank the proposal (High, Medium, Low)? Did the regional panel(s) identify significant benefits (regional priorities, linkages with other activities, local involvement) or impediments (local constraints, conflicts with other activities, lack of local involvement) to this proposal? What were they?

   The Bay Regional Review ranked the proposal as HIGH based on the potential to improve understanding of comparatively unaddressed species, habitats, and key ecosystem processes in the Bay.

6. **Administrative Review.** Were there significant concerns about the proposal with regard to the prior performance, environmental compliance and budget administrative reviews? What were they?

   The Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding Reviews indicated no problems. Environmental Compliance Review noted that both NEPA and a San Pablo Bay National Wildlife Refuge Special Use Permit, and the Budget Review detected no problem.

Miscellaneous comments:

None

Bay Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 236

Applicant Organization: US Geological Survey

Proposal Title: Ecosystem functions and habitat values of the San Pablo Bay shoals: integrated science in support of the CALFED ecosystem restoration program

Overall Ranking: **-**Low **-**Medium **X**High

Provide a brief summary explanation of the committee's ranking:

The panel supports research that delivers scientific information that improves understanding of key ecosystem processes in the Bay and about species and habitats that are insufficiently understood. Basic information on biological and hydro/geomorphological processes in the ecologically important tidal and subtidal shoals of San Pablo Bay is needed; this proposal addresses that need.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

   XYes **-**No

   How?

   Landowners are San Pablo Bay (SPB) NWR and State Lands; letter of support from NWR is included in proposal. Other permits will be obtained from DFG (no problems foreseen by panel). Bird banding permit will be updated. Applicants make a good case for being able to use temporal and spatial variation w/in the 3 year proposed study to model changes over longer periods.

2. Does the project pursue the restoration priorities applicable to the region as outlined in the PSP?

   XYes **-**No

   How?

   Would provide information in support of ERP Draft Stage I Implementation Goal 1 (at-risk species including delta smelt, chinook, green sturgeon, among others), Goal 2 (ecological processes, through monitoring and modelling flow variation vs. contaminants, primary productivity and NIS), PSP Priority 6, bullets 1, 3 and 4, (understand primary and secondary productivity in the North Bay, understand linkages between marshes and adjacent habitat, understand food webs of San Pablo Bay), Goal 3 (harvestable species, could benefit understanding of processes to improve Dungeness crab, Pacific herring, etc), Goal 5 (will study link between flow and NIS, e.g., Asian clam), and Goal 6 (water and sediment quality, i.e., bioaccumulation study portion of proposal). Would also support Bay Region priority 3 (NIS), 7 (will improve understanding of relationship of at-risk, native and NIS species and X2), and 8 (will use new and existing monitoring data to determine how flows affect at-risk species and harvestable fish. Also, may provide better understanding of how the entire ERP will affect SPB shoals.

3. Is the project adequately linked with other restoration activities in the region, such as ongoing implementation projects and regional planning efforts?

   XYes **-**No

   How?

   The study will build on work of earlier and ongoing studies, including studies of zooplankton, phytoplankton, ecology of diving ducks, and shorebird distribution in SPB, and current measurements of flow and suspended seds. The project will also study the affects of ongoing CALFED restoration projects on carbon and sediment flux in shoals. It will complement a similar study in the Delta on release of carbon from restored wetlands, and one on the sources and effects of selenium and carbon in the Delta. The project will provide information on the potential effects on the SPB shoals of reaching overall CALFED ERP goals.

4. Does the project adequately involve local people and institutions?

   XYes **-**No

   How?

   Applicants have coordinated with NWR, DFG, USGS, and USFWS and have involved Ducks Unlimited. Proposed outreach includes publications and scientific presentations, which is appropriate. Suggest possible briefings for decisionmakers.

Other Comments:

None.

External Scientific: #1

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **236**

Applicant Organization: **US Geological Survey**

Proposal Title: **Ecosystem functions and habitat values of the San Pablo Bay shoals: integrated science in support of the CALFED ecosystem restoration program**

Conflict of Interest Statements:
I have no financial interest in this proposal.
XCorrect
-Incorrect

In the blank below please explain any connection to proposal, to applicant, co-applicant or subcontractor or to submitting institution (write "none" if no connection):

None

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

Excellent: outstanding in all respects;
Good: quality but some deficiencies;
Poor: serious deficiencies.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	**Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating**
XExcellent	**Excellent proposal that addresses a major scientific and conceptual gap in the CALFED restoration program; $5 million budget may actually be justifiable given multidisciplinary approach and difficulty in studying the shoals ecosystem.**
-Good	
-Poor	

1. **Goals.** Are the goals, objectives and hypotheses clearly stated and internally consistent? Is the concept timely and important?

   Goals, objectives and hypotheses are all explicitly stated and highly integrated. The concept represented by this proposal is EXCEEDINGLY timely and important.

2. **Justification.** Is the study justified relative to existing knowledge? Is a conceptual model clearly stated in the proposal and does it explain the underlying basis for the proposed work? Is the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project justified?

The rationale and justification of the proposed research is very persuasive and well documented. The high level of scientific background and logical proposal development is still unfortunately rare among the present CALFED proposals under review.

3. **Approach.** Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project? Are results likely to add to the base of knowledge? Is the project likely to generate novel information, methodology or approaches? Will the information ultimately be useful to decision-makers?

   Although typically risky because of the intense scientific coordination

4. **Feasibility.** Is the approach fully documented and technically feasible? What is the likelihood of success? Is the scale of the project consistent with the objectives?

   With adequate scientific and information coordination (again, this is a major assumption!), this project is fundamentally feasible, with high likelihood of success. The scale of the project is in all respects consistent with the objectives.

5. **Project-Specific Performance Measures.** Does the project include appropriate performance measures to measure success relative to the project's goals and objectives? Is there enough detail as to how the performance measures will be quantified? For restoration projects, are monitoring plans explicit and detailed enough to determine if performance measures will be adequately assessed?

   Although not necessarily as applicable to a complex scientific investigation, compared to a restoration project, the performance measures described by this proposal are a bit lame give the level of funding and the interdependence of the complex interdisciplinary datasets.

6. **Products.** Are products of value likely from the project? Specifically for restoration projects, are products of value also likely from the monitoring component? Are interpretative outcomes likely from the project?

   Although not necessarily as applicable to a complex scientific investigation, compared to a restoration project, the performance measures described by this proposal are a bit lame give the level of funding and the interdependence of the complex interdisciplinary datasets.

7. **Capabilities.** What is the track record of applicants in terms of past projects? Is the project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project? Do they have available the infrastructure and other aspects of support necessary to accomplish the project?

   It may actually be impossible to come up with a better team of ?tier 1? scientists to tackle this project. However, project management and integration of both science and information is VERY poorly defined and lack of a rigid organizational infrastructure approach to this could doom this project; highly interdisciplinary science is not a routine restoration project and may require some external (CALFED?) oversight and advisement?

8. **Cost/Benefit Comments.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

   Obviously, ~$5 million for three years is a significant funding commitment for CALFED. However, this information is essential if CALFED and the Bay/Delta scientific community is to incorporate all ecosystem components in an evaluation of the potential CALFED restoration and water management scenarios.

Miscellaneous comments:

Excellent proposal that addresses a major scientific and conceptual gap in the CALFED restoration program; $5 million budget may actually be justifiable given multidisciplinary approach and difficulty in studying the shoals ecosystem.

External Scientific: #2

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **236**

Applicant Organization: **US Geological Survey**

Proposal Title: **Ecosystem functions and habitat values of the San Pablo Bay shoals: integrated science in support of the CALFED ecosystem restoration program**

Conflict of Interest Statements:
I have no financial interest in this proposal.
XCorrect
-Incorrect

In the blank below please explain any connection to proposal, to applicant, co-applicant or subcontractor or to submitting institution (write "none" if no connection):

I know one of the co-authors (Lavvorn) through professional contacts at meetings. I hosted one of his graduate students at our laboratory several years ago. He also was involved in writing a section of a report we produced in 1993.

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

Excellent: outstanding in all respects;
Good: quality but some deficiencies;
Poor: serious deficiencies.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	**Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating**
-Excellent	**This project is between good and excellent. A much stronger integration stratgey and a much stronger product delivery proposal are needed. Otherwise, I see several excellent indepnedent studies that may or may not integrate, and no useful decision tool will emerge. At the very least, there is a high probability, with the excllent team members, that good science will be done that will deliver new findings about the Bay system. How this enters and affects the decision process is unclear.**
XGood	
-Poor	

1. **Goals.** Are the goals, objectives and hypotheses clearly stated and internally consistent? Is the concept timely and important?

   The main goal is clear and very broad, and appears to be relevant to the mission of the CalFed program. Unfortunately, it is somewhat buried in the text on page 4. On wonders if the goal was well integrated in the minds of the proposers. The goal should be stated clearly and up front. This drives the entire study design. If it is not clear and up front, there is the perception that it is not the first thing in the minds of the researchers. In a large and diverse

study such as this, there must be an organizing principle or goal for the entire team.

2. **Justification.** Is the study justified relative to existing knowledge? Is a conceptual model clearly stated in the proposal and does it explain the underlying basis for the proposed work? Is the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project justified?

   The conceptual model is somewhat simple but does clearly identify linkages among the physical and biological compoenent of the system being studied. Justification for such a broad study is based on developing a better understdaning of the the effects of chages in forcing factors on selected resources in the system. This in itself is an important justification. There is a weak justification related to the loss of sediment because of restoration of wetlands upstream. One wonders whether the shoals were historically an important ecosystem or if the mining activities created extensive shoals and now they are eroding. This is natural. There is no clear statement as to how the study will provide managers with ways to judge whether shoals are worth preserving or not relative to historical conditions, and wetland restoration efforts.

3. **Approach.** Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project? Are results likely to add to the base of knowledge? Is the project likely to generate novel information, methodology or approaches? Will the information ultimately be useful to decision-makers?

   The methods identified for each component of the study are very appropriate for meeting the objectives. Results will undoubtedly add significantly to the understanding of the general ecology of the Bay systems. The models may provide novel tools for decision makers, but there is a paucity of information in the proposal to make me feel comfortable with concluding that the models will be developed in a way to help decision makers. Typically, models are developed by an individual who is the only one who can easily apply them. There is no mention of how these models will be made available for general use. I would recommend abandoning the models unless there is a clear path for transferring the models to decision makers. Otherwise, even if they are excellent, they will essesntially be useless.

4. **Feasibility.** Is the approach fully documented and technically feasible? What is the likelihood of success? Is the scale of the project consistent with the objectives?

   Yes, the studies are technicaly feasible, although I am cncerned about the abilty to use predator exclosures effectively in this system. I suspect that this will be a major challenge.

5. **Project-Specific Performance Measures.** Does the project include appropriate performance measures to measure success relative to the project's goals and objectives? Is there enough detail as to how the performance measures will be quantified? For restoration projects, are monitoring plans explicit and detailed enough to determine if performance measures will be adequately assessed?

   Performance measures are vague and weak. Giving talks and publishing papers are the minimum products that should cme out of this work. Viable, easily used decision tools should be a major outcome.

6. **Products.** Are products of value likely from the project? Specifically for restoration projects, are products of value also likely from the monitoring component? Are interpretative outcomes likely from the project?

See No. 5 above. The products should be directly useable and have a significant impact on the management decisions. This is not empahsized nearly enough in the proposal. The perception (not necessarily the intent of the reseachers) is that they want to do this very neat study but only for their own benefit.

7. **Capabilities.** What is the track record of applicants in terms of past projects? Is the project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project? Do they have available the infrastructure and other aspects of support necessary to accomplish the project?

   This is an excellent and well qualified team, that should have good institutonal support.

8. **Cost/Benefit Comments.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

   The budget seem reasonable overall for this magnitude of study.

Miscellaneous comments:

The project integration discussion is weak, and leads me to wonder how serious the team is about this. Meetings are OK but what will be done at the meetings. What are the outcomes? What if a member is not doing what they said they would do? What if there is a major hydrological event that changes the direction of the study? What points will be covered at the meetings? Integration is very weak in this study as it is proposed.

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #1

New Proposal Number: 236

New Proposal Title: Ecosystem functions and habitat values of the San Pablo Bay shoals: integrated science in support of the CALFED ecosystem restoration program

1. Prior CALFED project numbers, titles, and programs: (*list only projects for which you are the contract manager*)

   NOTE the Prior/Ongoing CALFED Project Title and Number do not match on the faxed list and the beginning and end of the title is missing -- you have listed ....matter in the habitat and its relationship to the food chain....as 97-B06?? Following are the three agreements with correct Title and Number and Project Manager that I have administered with USGS:

   CALFED #97-B02, USBR #98-AA-20-16230 - U.S. Geological Survey - Sedimentation Movement, Availability and Monitoring in the Delta - David Schoellhamer

   CALFED #97-B06, USBR #98-AA-20-16240 - U.S. Geological Survey - Assessment of the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta as Habitat for Production of the Food Resources that Support Fish Recruitment - William Sobczak

   CALFED #98-B07, USBR #98-AA-20-16950 - U.S. Geological Survey - Assessment of the Impacts of Selenium on Restoration of the San Francisco Bay-Delta Ecosystem - Sam Luoma

2. Prior CVPIA project numbers, titles, and programs: (*list only projects for which you are the contract manager*)

   N/A

3. Have negotiations about contracts or contact amendments with this applicant proceeded smoothly, without persistent difficulties related to standard contract terms and conditions?

   XYes **-**No **-**N/A

   If no, please explain any difficulties:

4. Are the status, progress, and accomplishments of the applicant's current CALFED or CVPIA project(s) accurately stated?

   -Yes **-**No **X**N/A

   If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

5. Is the applicant's progress towards these project(s)' milestones and outcomes to date satisfactory?

   -Yes **-**No **X**N/A

   If no, please explain deficiencies:

6. Is the applicant's reporting, records keeping, and financial management of these projects satisfactory?

   -Yes -No **X**N/A

   If no, please explain deficiencies:

7. Will the project(s) be ready for next phase funding in 2002, based on its current progress and expenditure rates?

   -Yes -No **X**N/A

   If no, please explain:

Other Comments:

USGS agreements are invoiced directly through a central billing system and do not require my personal approval as an interagency agreement, therefore it is a little harder to track aside from deliverables and quarterly reports received. All three USGS agreements are complete, with a final report due from 98-B07, agreement ending December 31, 2001. No problems encountered in my dealings with the three project managers for 97-B02, 97-B06, or 98-B07.

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #2

New Proposal Number: 236

New Proposal Title: Ecosystem functions and habitat values of the San Pablo Bay shoals: integrated science in support of the CALFED ecosystem restoration program

1. Prior CALFED project numbers, titles, and programs: (*list only projects for which you are the contract manager*)

   01-N19, Ecological Monitoring of the Tolay Creek and Cullinan Ranch Tidal Wetland Restoration Projects - Ducks Unlimited. Ecosystem Restoration

   Please note - Applicant for this proposal is USGS

2. Prior CVPIA project numbers, titles, and programs: (*list only projects for which you are the contract manager*)

   N/A

3. Have negotiations about contracts or contact amendments with this applicant proceeded smoothly, without persistent difficulties related to standard contract terms and conditions?

   -Yes **X**No -N/A

   If no, please explain any difficulties:

   Interagency agreement was negotiated between CALFED-USGS. NFWF was not involved in contract negotiation, only implmentation.

4. Are the status, progress, and accomplishments of the applicant's current CALFED or CVPIA project(s) accurately stated?

   XYes -No -N/A

   If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

5. Is the applicant's progress towards these project(s)' milestones and outcomes to date satisfactory?

   XYes -No -N/A

   If no, please explain deficiencies:

   Project 01-N19 is on schedule, progressing satisfactorily.

6. Is the applicant's reporting, records keeping, and financial management of these projects satisfactory?

   XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

7. Will the project(s) be ready for next phase funding in 2002, based on its current progress and expenditure rates?

   -Yes -No **X**N/A

   If no, please explain:

Other Comments:

This project is not a next phase effort of a current CALFED project. Applicant is working with DU on 01-N19.

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #3

New Proposal Number: 236

New Proposal Title: Ecosystem functions and habitat values of the San Pablo Bay shoals: integrated science in support of the CALFED ecosystem restoration program

1. Prior CALFED project numbers, titles, and programs: (*list only projects for which you are the contract manager*)

   00-G01 Dissolved Organic Carbon Release from Wetlands - Part 2

2. Prior CVPIA project numbers, titles, and programs: (*list only projects for which you are the contract manager*)

   none

3. Have negotiations about contracts or contact amendments with this applicant proceeded smoothly, without persistent difficulties related to standard contract terms and conditions?

   XYes -No -N/A

   If no, please explain any difficulties:

   Language has been negotiated for USGS contracts that should provide a solid template for future contracting efforts.

4. Are the status, progress, and accomplishments of the applicant's current CALFED or CVPIA project(s) accurately stated?

   XYes -No -N/A

   If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

   Could be better, most recent status report in the CALFED file is from March 2001.

5. Is the applicant's progress towards these project(s)' milestones and outcomes to date satisfactory?

   XYes -No -N/A

   If no, please explain deficiencies:

6. Is the applicant's reporting, records keeping, and financial management of these projects satisfactory?

   XYes -No -N/A

   If no, please explain deficiencies:

7. Will the project(s) be ready for next phase funding in 2002, based on its current progress and expenditure rates?

   -Yes -No **X**N/A

   If no, please explain:

Other Comments:

none

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #4

New Proposal Number: 236

New Proposal Title: Ecosystem functions and habitat values of the San Pablo Bay shoals: integrated science in support of the CALFED ecosystem restoration program

1. Prior CALFED project numbers, titles, and programs: (*list only projects for which you are the contract manager*)

   99-F11 Effects of Introduced Clams on the Food Supply of Bay-Delta Fish Species.

2. Prior CVPIA project numbers, titles, and programs: (*list only projects for which you are the contract manager*)

3. Have negotiations about contracts or contact amendments with this applicant proceeded smoothly, without persistent difficulties related to standard contract terms and conditions?

   XYes -No -N/A

   If no, please explain any difficulties:

4. Are the status, progress, and accomplishments of the applicant's current CALFED or CVPIA project(s) accurately stated?

   XYes -No -N/A

   If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

5. Is the applicant's progress towards these project(s)' milestones and outcomes to date satisfactory?

   XYes -No -N/A

   If no, please explain deficiencies:

6. Is the applicant's reporting, records keeping, and financial management of these projects satisfactory?

   XYes -No -N/A

   If no, please explain deficiencies:

7. Will the project(s) be ready for next phase funding in 2002, based on its current progress and expenditure rates?

   -Yes -No **X**N/A

   If no, please explain:

Other Comments:

NA this is not a next phase proposal for 99-F11.

Environmental Compliance:

Proposal Number: 236

Applicant Organization: US Geological Survey

Proposal Title: Ecosystem functions and habitat values of the San Pablo Bay shoals: integrated science in support of the CALFED ecosystem restoration program

1. Are the legal or regulatory issues that affect the proposal identified adequately in the proposal?

   XYes **-**No

   If no, please explain:

   This is a federally funded project and requires NEPA compliance.

   On the Environmental Compliance Checklist, Federal Permits and Approvals, list "required" next to "Other" since the applicant will be obtaining a Special Use Permit from San Pablo Bay National Wildlife Refuge.

2. Does the project's timeline and budget reflect adequate planning to address legal and regulatory issues that affect the proposal?

   XYes **-**No

   If no, please explain:

   No budget or timeline specified.

3. Do the legal and regulatory issues that affect the proposal significantly impair the project's feasibility?

   -Yes **X**No

   If yes, please explain:

   NEPA compliance required.

Other Comments:

Budget:

Proposal Number: 236

Applicant Organization: US Geological Survey

Proposal Title: Ecosystem functions and habitat values of the San Pablo Bay shoals: integrated science in support of the CALFED ecosystem restoration program

1. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each year of requested support?

   XYes -No

   If no, please explain:

2. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each task identified?

   XYes -No

   If no, please explain:

3. Does the proposal clearly state the type of expenses encompassed in indirect rates or overhead costs?

   XYes -No

   If no, please explain:

4. Are appropriate project management costs clearly identified?

   XYes -No

   If no, please explain:

5. Do the total funds requested (Form I, Question 17A) equal the combined total annual costs in the budget summary?

   XYes -No

   If no, please explain (for example, are costs to be reimbursed by cost share funds included in the budget summary).

6. Does the budget justification adequately explain major expenses?

   XYes -No

   If no, please explain:

7. Are there other budget issues that warrant consideration?

-Yes **X**No

If yes, please explain:

Other Comments: